DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 645 TM 034 256

AUTHOR	Fenton, Ray
TITLE	Status of Standards Implementation in Anchorage Secondary Schools: A Concerns Based Acceptance Model (CBAM) Review, 2001-2002.
INSTITUTION	Anchorage School District, AK.
PUB DATE	2002-04-00
NOTE	19p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; Benchmarking; Educational Change; Program Implementation; School Districts; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Anchorage School District AK; *Concerns Based Adoption Model

ABSTRACT

The Concerns Based Acceptance Model (CBAM) has been a key element in developing and assessing the implementation of science and mathematics programs over the past 20 years. CBAM provides an organized approach to assessing where people stand as they learn about, and accept, changes in organizations. This study examined the status of the adoption of Alaska and Anchorage Standards and Benchmarks in the secondary schools of the Anchorage School District. Curriculum coordinators collected data in all secondary schools after a review of both the CBAM process and an evaluation instrument adapted to focus on the implementation of a standards-based approach. The CBAM approach allows the characterization of the acceptance of an innovation based on concerns that participants express in natural conversation. The picture provided by the CBAM process shows that the overall status of the Anchorage District places the programs in the third and fourth stages of adopting a standards-based system. The district is well beyond the informational stages and is now struggling with collaboration, assessment strategies, integration of lessons, and curriculum. Appendix A summarizes ratings by school and area, and Appendix B contains the data collection protocol. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 645

2001-2002
Status of Standards Implementation in Anchorage Secondary Schools: A Concerns Based Acceptance Model (CBAM) Review

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Fenton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

TM034256

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Ray Fenton
Anchorage SD
Assessment and Evaluation
April, 2002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

The Concerns Based Acceptance Model (CBAM) has been used as a key element in developing and assessing the implementation of national science and mathematics programs over the past 20 years. The model is based on the belief that whatever outcome one desires when one introduces an innovation based on the performance of human beings one has to start with the level of knowledge and acceptance found in those you wish to change. The model assumes that the best way to understand the level of introduction of an innovation like standards-based curriculum and instruction is to listen to what those

CBAM provides an organized approach to assessing where people stand as they learn about and accept change in organizations. This report examines the status of the adoption of Alaska and Anchorage Standards and Benchmarks in our secondary schools. Curriculum Coordinators collected data in all secondary schools after a review of both the CBAM process and an evaluation instrument adapted to focus on the implementation of a standards based approach (Appendix B).

The CBAM approach allows the characterization of the acceptance of an innovation based on the concerns that participants express in natural conversation. Curriculum Coordinators initiated a discussion of standards in each school and then categorized the comments of individuals. In some cases, the Curriculum Coordinator introduced the faculty groups to the CBAM process and asked them to rate themselves. However, the final rating of each school is based on the assessment of the Curriculum Coordinators of the degree to which standards-based curriculum and instruction has taken hold in each of the schools.

The Meaning of Ratings

Groups are rated on the seven-point scale that ranges from 0 to 6. The higher the score the more likely that a group has fully accepted and incorporated the innovation into the life of the group. A rating of 0 through 2 suggests that the innovation is in the early stages of introduction, a 3 or 4 indicates that individuals are adapting to the innovation, and a 5 or 6 indicates that the institution is adapting and that the innovation has become central to the way the organization does business.

The ideal for any organization is to reach level 6. However, it not uncommon for systems to be judged as successful in the introduction of an innovation when various elements have reached a score of 5. When a score of 5 is reached, individuals within the organization are initiating activity on their own to improve the impact of the innovation on the institution.

It is not uncommon for the component parts of organizations to have various rates of adoption and different degrees of acceptance of an innovation. Differences among individuals within a unit can be substantial. In the early stages of adoptions, leaders tend

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to be at a higher level of both commitment and knowledge. At late stages, leaders may have the same level of commitment but be lower in knowledge of the details of the innovation than other members of the organization. As adoptions of innovations become mature, the role of leadership needs to focus more on reinforcement and support for change that others initiate.

Performance below level 5 can reflect a great deal of organizational change but the innovation will be hard to sustain without ongoing organized management support and monitoring. Anchorage secondary schools are now generally at level 3 or 4 in the change process.

Concerns Based Adoption Stages

Status/Stage	*Description*	*Typical Statement*
0	Awareness	What are standards?
1	Informational Concerns	How is this different from what I'm dong now?
2	Personal Concerns	How will this affect how I am evaluated? Do I know enough to teach this way?
3	Management Concerns	How do I use these curriculum materials?
4	Consequence Concerns	Does this make a difference for my students or me?
5	Collaboration Concerns	How do I coordinate this with other teachers? How do we work together to assure the success of every individual student?
6	Refocusing Concerns	How can we as a district (school) change to be more successful with our "at-risk" students?

Anchorage Curriculum Coordinators made visits to each high school and middle school to meet with the faculty in their curriculum areas. Appointments were made in advance and where possible the meeting was a regular departmental meeting. Arrangements were made through Department Chairs and the purpose of the visits was discussed with the staff members. In most cases, the Curriculum Coordinator shared the CBAM standards-based assessment instrument with the school staff members.

Some Coordinators provided a simple score for a department group. Others provided a range of scores. Assessment calculated the median position where a range of scores was provided. However, it is important to note that some of the ranges reported within one faculty ranged from 2 to 5. This suggests that some individuals have not accepted a standards-based approach even in schools that have an overall rating of 3 or 4.

The Table below identifies the Curriculum Coordinators who met with school departments in their content areas.

Curriculum Area	*Coordinator – Data Collector*
Career Technology	Rick Rios
Health/Physical Education	Sharon Vaissier
Literacy Program	Mardell Kiesel
Mathematics Program	Sandy Schoff
Music Department	Jean Lenoir
Science	Gail Raymond
Social Studies	Mary Bristol
World Languages	Janice Gullickson

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The tables below illustrate the grouping of CBAM responses for the Anchorage schools. Individual school ratings range from the low just above 3.0 to a high of 4.0. The averages for the various curriculum areas are grouped from the middle of the 3 range into the low 4 range. In general, those areas that have had substantial support from outside sources for teacher training and curriculum development have higher ratings.

Anchorage Degree of Implementation by Secondary School Level (X)

Level	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
High School				XXX	XX		
Middle School				XXXXXXX XX			

Anchorage Degree of Implementation by Curriculum Area (X)

Level	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Art				X			
Music				X			
Health					X		
World Language				X			
Math				X			
Social Studies					X		
Literacy				X			
Career Tech					X		

The graphic illustration of the organization of the ratings may provide a better overall sense of the degree of implementation of standards in ASD than the actual median scores and averages that are displayed in Appendix A. Differences in data collection, the standards used by the Curriculum Coordinators, and the extent to which a single staff discussion can provide a stable indicator are all contributors to the imprecision in the rating process.

On the other hand, the process has provided a consistent pattern of data that places Anchorage clearly in the middle of the process of implementing a standards-based system of instruction.

Observations of Curriculum Coordinators

Curriculum Coordinators were asked to listen to the comments made in the faculty meetings to determine where there were opportunities to provide support that would help the faculty groups at the individual schools move forward to help all students meet State

and District Standards. Many of the comments were specific to individual schools, specific to courses within curriculum areas, or specific to the current status of the curriculum review cycle for an individual content area.

There were, however, comments that were general enough to bridge the various curriculum areas while being specific enough to provide guidance for curriculum managers when considering the next steps in developing an effective effort to support teachers and schools in implementing standards-based instruction.

-Middle School Specific

- Middle School elective classes do not count toward accountability.
- Middle School integration is limited to core classes while other classes are excluded.
- New staff members and new department chairs need training in performance standards.
- More contact is needed between middle schools and feeder schools so those teachers on both sides understand the curriculum and performance requirements for students who have to make the transition.
- Need Middle Level Cross-District Inservice on language arts to establish common district expectations.
- Consider the Middle School Model on instructional time. Are we getting our "bang for the buck" in the middle school model? We need to assess student growth.
- We need to be recognized for what we have accomplished as well as to plan for continued growth.
- We will never make 5 & 6 on the scale without more District support and time for training.
- I would like to work with other teachers in my content area rather than just with the teachers on my team.
- We need to figure out which standards need to be taught when, and how to prepare students for the benchmark tests.
- We need to take care not to push students too fast based on their test scores.
- Big class size is a problem when you want to do various types of problems and adapt instruction to individual students.
- We need to have contact with the senior high departments to know what is expected of our students when they get to high school. Content of high school and middle school classes need to be aligned.
- Need more practice with rubric-based scoring.
- Meaningful integration of content on teams is difficult. Some teams do it well and others do not do so well resulting in wasted student time.
- Math standards are not addressed as often outside math classes as literacy standards are addressed outside language arts classes. More training is needed to address math standards in social studies and science classes.
- More time is needed for content collaboration. Too much planning time is spent on administrative details. We will just get surface compliance on standards if we do not get the time we need for deeper work.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

-High School Specific

- There needs to be more sharing of successful programs between schools.
- More training on curriculum materials and how to make effective use of them in the classroom.
- Data from the State and local assessments is not provided in a timely manner and it does not do us any good. It just takes away instructional time.
- Test data is a waste of resources. It does not tell us how to adapt or improve instruction for the individual student.
- Shortage of teachers with specific skills results in teachers teaching courses in which they have little background or training. These teachers need more support.
- We need to have a set of questions like the EXIT test to help prepare students with the content and the form of the test questions.
- What can we do about students who lack the basic skills needed for success who are put into our classes?
- Not enough classes are offered for resource and special education students. They struggle and fail when dumped into regular classes without adequate support.
- Teachers need to be able to directly access student test scores and records to know where their students stand. We need a better database and direct teacher access to it.
- There needs to be more work with the six-trait writing model in classes in various content areas.
- We need more grant money to support time to share ideas, use data, make connections, and develop alternative forms of assessment.
- We need to continue the work on aligning curriculum to standards.
- More Roger Taylor.
- We need more expository writing and time spent on student research to get to higher-level skills.

General

- Our classes need pre- and post-performance assessments that line up with standards and the HSGQE.
- We need a grant that will stress teaching reading and writing in all of the curriculum areas.
- We need to collect data on which programs and materials are more effective.
- Curriculum materials need to be aligned with standards-based lessons. We need to "plan backwards" from what is required for student success.
- How can we meet the needs of all students with a single standards-based curriculum?
- How do we direct resources to those students who seem to be determined to fail?
- We do not assess all of the content standards. To what extent should we try to address all of the standards when they are not all assessed?

Conclusions from the Review.

The CBAM process provides both a picture of our status and some sense of direction for what still needs to be done to accomplish the goal of having a standards-based instructional system that results in student success.

The overall status of the district places our programs into the 3rd and 4th stage of adopting a standards-based system. We are well beyond the informational stages at the lower level of the model and struggling with collaboration, assessment strategies, integration of lessons and curriculum, and fitting together a system that consistently tracks the progress of students toward success on the State Benchmarks, State High School Graduation Exam, and the granting of a diploma.

From the point-of-view of the teachers across the curriculum areas, integration and alignment are pressing issues. The core curriculum area comments appear to be commonly in stage 5 while the comments in some of the other areas are more often in stage 4. This suggests that there is more need to integrate the effort across the curriculum areas and focus on all areas.

There are common concerns about the students who have trouble keeping up. Some comments suggest that more needs to be done in the regular classroom to track and individualize instruction. Some comments suggest that more has to be done at the level of the system to assure the proper diagnosis and placement of students. There seems to be an agreement that additional support is needed those students who do not move quite as quickly forward.

There is a concern with Special Education Students and Bilingual Students getting the support that they need to meet standards.

There is a concern with Assessment and Evaluation providing information on students when and where it is needed.

There is a continuing concern across areas, levels, and schools about the amount of time that is needed to allow for the training, collaboration, and integration needed to reach level 6.

Where do we go from here?

The basic tenant of the Concerns Based Adoption Model is that you take individuals where they stand, address their concerns, and help them move along to a higher level.

A few departments in a few locations are still at Stage 2 (Personal Concerns), though most have moved on to higher level. At the locations that are at level 2, the focus still needs to be on training in standards and the link between standards and student success. Because of the range of scores for individuals in departments categorized as being at

Stage 2, there is also a need to make more advanced training and curriculum support available to convince individuals that standards-based instruction will be a benefit to students.

Overall, it appears that the Anchorage School District focus needs to be on Stage 3 and Stage 4. These departments may generally be categorized as having implementation concerns. At this stage the critical elements are support for trying and adopting new classroom practices and rapid feedback on the processes that prove to be more effective. A critical element is the linking of information on individual student performance with the instructional alternatives that are available within the classroom and within the school. Teachers need to learn how to manage the resources that they have and focus them on individual students.

A few faculty and department groups have reached the top of Stage 4 or even Stage 5. The focus here has to shift from the introduction of the individual to the tools and skills needed for a standards-based system to restructuring the curriculum and institutional structure to assure that the instructional delivery system provides every student the resources needed for success. New practices and materials need to be introduced and developed need to change institutional life and point-of-view. Organizational support and leadership, orientation and integration of new staff members, and renewal have to be the focus for the groups that are in the lead in adopting standards-based curriculum and instruction.

It takes strong institutional leadership to maintain and assure that there is a continuing focus on standards based instruction. Measuring every proposed change in terms of the impact that it will have on student achievement and the assessment of programs in terms of their impact on achievement are the key elements in keeping the Anchorage School District's focus on standards and improvement.

Bibliography

(These will help you understand the CBAM system as a tool for assessing change in Curriculum and Evaluation.)

Guskey, Thomas R. "Staff Development and the Process of Teacher Change." *Educational Researcher* 15 (May 1986): Pp. 5-12.

Gass, Jeannette H. "Implementing the Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics." *Arithmetic Teacher* (January 1993) Pp. 286-289.

Hall, Gene E. and Shirley M. Hord. Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process. Albany, N.Y.: State University Press, 1987.

Loucks-Horsley, Susan and Suzanne Stiegelbauer. "Using Knowledge of Change to Guide Staff Development." In Staff Development for Education in the 90s: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives, edited by Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, Pp. 15-35. New York: Teachers College Press. 1991.

Appendix A

Summary of Ratings by School and Area

Curriculum and Evaluation
CBAM Model: Stages of Concern Related to Implementation of ASD Standards

MIDDLE SCHOOLS	Art	Music	Health & P.E.	World Languages	Math	Science	Social Studies	Literacy	Career Technology	Curriculum Average
Central Middle School of Science	2.5	3.0	4.5	4.5	3.0	2.5	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.7
Clark Middle School	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	2.5	3.5		3.0	3.1
Goldenview Middle School	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	3.5	5.0	4.0	1.0	3.8
Gruening Middle School	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	1.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	2.0	3.8
Hanshew Middle School	2.0	4.0		3.5	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.0	3.8
Mears Middle School	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5		3.5	3.0	3.4
Mirror Lake Middle School	5.0	3.0	4.5	-	5.5	4.5	3.5	3.0	1.0	3.8
Romig Middle School	5.0	3.0		4.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	1.0	3.7
Wendler Middle School	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	1.0	3.8
Average Middle Schools	3.7	3.3	4.3	3.9	3.7	3.8	4.3	4.1	2.1	3.7
Range Middle Schools	2.5-5.0	3.0-4.0	3.0-5.0	3.0-4.5	1.5-5.5	2.0-5.0	3.5-5.0	3.0-5.0	1.0-4.0	3.1-3.9

HIGH SCHOOLS	Art	Music	Health & P.E.	World Languages	Math	Science	Social Studies	Literacy	Career Technology	Curriculum Average
Bartlett High School	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.9
Chugiak High School	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	3.5	4.1
Dimond High School	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.0		4.0	2.0	3.5	3.3
East High School	4.5	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.5	3.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	3.9
Service High School	2.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.6
West High School	4.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	5.0	2.0	3.0	3.6
Average- High Schools	3.6	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.2	4.7	3.5	3.3	3.7
Range High Schools	3.0-4.5	3.0-4.0	3.5-5.0	3.5-5.0	2.0-4.5	3.0-5.0	4.5-5.0	2.0-5.0	3.0-3.5	3.3-4.1
Average - All Schools	3.9	3.6	4.5	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.2	4.2	4.5	4.0

Assessment and Evaluation summary of reports prepared by ASD Curriculum Coordinators after interviews with Departmental groups conducted in February and March, 2002
Individual school data was often reported as a range. Ranges were reduced to the median of the reported range by Assessment and Evaluation.
CBAM Ranges: 1 - Awareness, 2 - Informational Concerns, 3 - Management Concerns, 4 - Consequence Concerns, 5 - Collaboration Concerns, 6 - Refocusing Concerns

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B – Anchorage Standards Based Curriculum and Instruction Data Collection Protocol

STAGES OF CONCERN AS THEY RELATE TO NEW DIRECTION IN STANDARDS BASED INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT (Con't)

Stages of Concern	Expression of Concern	Typical Statements	Professional Development, Dissemination, and Other Strategies
Stage 6 Refocusing Concerns	Exploring more universal benefits of implementation including major changes or replacement of existing forms	I think our district would be more successful with "at-risk" students if a project approach were used in Reading, Writing and Math classes. How do our curriculum adoptions have to change? How does school organization have and service delivery models have to change? What evidence do we have that this program is the most successful? Where are we being most successful?	1. Respect and encourage teacher interests. 2. Channel their ideas and energies: act on concerns. 3. Accept that they may replace or significantly modify existing frameworks. 4. Provide opportunities for visits, participation in institutes, networks, etc.
Stage 5 Collaboration Concerns	Coordination and cooperation with other to better meet the need of all their students.	Wouldn't it be better if our grade level team planned our Reading, Writing and Math instruction together? What progress are students making prior to my grade? How do we coordinate our efforts to assure all students learn what they need to pass the Benchmark Exams?	1. Provide opportunities to develop skills needed to work collaboratively. 2. Bring people together. 3. Rearrange schedule so people can collaborate. 4. Encourage teachers to provide technical assistance to other teachers. 5. Encourage - don't force - collaboration.
Stage 4 Consequence Concerns	Impact of implementation on students; refining so students benefit.	Is all this effort really making a difference for my students? What can I do to improve student learning? How do I know what our program moved students forward fast enough? Are we really leaving do child behind?	1. Provide teachers with opportunities to visit other and attend conferences. 2. Provide positive feedback and needed support. 3. Provide opportunities for teachers to share knowledge and skills. 4. Provide student and program assessment strategies. 5. Provide training in peer coaching.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STAGES OF CONCERN AS THEY RELATE TO NEW DIRECTION IN STANDARDS BASED INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT

Stages of Concern	Expression of Concern	Typical Statements	Professional Development, Dissemination, and Other Strategies
Stage 3 Management Concerns	Focus on the processes and tasks of implementation: efficiency, organization, management, scheduling, time, and materials.	How do I use these materials? Why is this taking so much time to plan? What grouping strategy will work best? What best prepares students for assessment? How do I get the help I need to support diverse student performers?	1. Focus on a specific area for change. 2. Answer specific "how-to" questions. 3. Identify sequences of specific activities and set timelines for implementation. 4. Avoid considering future impact at this time.
Stage 2 Personal Concerns	Uncertain about personal ability: demands of implementing new instruction, relation to reward structure, decision making, areas of potential conflict, and financial or status implications for self and colleagues.	How will I be evaluated? Do I know enough to teach to standards? Will my students gain on the State Tests?	1. Address personal concerns directly (e.g., clarify impact on evaluation). 2. Use personal notes and conversations. 3. Connect teachers who will be supportive. 4. Implement changes progressively over time. 5. Provide encouragement and support – do not push.
State 1 Informational Concerns	Seeking a general awareness of and details about new directions: characteristics, effects, and requirements for implementation	What does it look like to use Reading, Writing, Math as well as subject matters with Standards Based Instruction and Assessments?	1. Provide clear and accurate information. 2. Use a variety of ways to share information (e.g., video). 3. Visit each other's classrooms. 4. Relate changes to current practices (similarities/differences).
Stage 0 Awareness Concerns	Little concern or involvement with Standards	What Reading, Writing and Math Standards? What State tests?	1. Involve teachers in discussion and decisions. 2. Arouse interest. 3. Give permission not to know. 4. Encourage sharing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STAGES OF CONCERN MATRIX

Stages of Concern	Expression of Concern	Typical Statements	Professional Development, Dissemination, and Other Strategies
Stage 6 Refocusing Concerns	Exploring more universal benefits of implementation including major changes or replacement of existing forms.		
Stage 5 Collaboration Concerns	Coordination and corporation with others to better meet the needs of all their students.		
Stage 4 Consequence Concerns	Impact of implementation on students; refining so students benefits.		
Stage 3 Management Concerns	Focus on the processes and tasks on implementation: efficiency, organization, management, scheduling, time, and materials.		
Stage 2 Personal Concerns	Uncertain about demands of implementing new instruction, relation to reward structure, decision making, area of potential conflict, and financial or status implications for self and colleagues.		
Stage 1 Informational Concerns	Seeking a general awareness of and details about new directions: characteristics, effects, and requirements for implementation.		
Stage 0 Awareness Concerns	Little concern or involvement with Reading, Writing, Math and Standards Based Instruction and Assessments		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Listing of Schools

Curriculum Area: _____

School Name	Stage	Top 3 Opportunities
Central		1. 2. 3.
Clark		1. 2. 3.
Goldenview		1. 2. 3.
Gruening		1. 2. 3.
Hanshew		1. 2. 3.
Mears		1. 2. 3.
Mirror Lake		1. 2. 3.
Romig		1. 2. 3.
Wendler		1. 2. 3.
Bartlett		1. 2. 3.
Chugiak High		1. 2. 3.
Dimond		1. 2. 3.
East		1. 2. 3.
Service		1. 2. 3.
West		1. 2. 3.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM034256

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
(OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: 2001-2002 Status of Standards Implementation in Anchorage Secondary Schools: A Concerns Based Acceptance Model (CBAM) Review

Author(s): Ray Fenton

Corporate Source: Anchorage School District

Publication Date: April, 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
☑	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Ray Fenton	Printed Name/Position/Title: Ray Fenton, Supervisor
Organization/Address: ASD - Assessment P.O. Box 196614 Anchorage, AK 99519	Telephone: 907 742-4420 Fax: 907 742-4430
	E-mail Address: FentonResearch@aol.com Date: 5/22/02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:	
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation **1129 Shriver Laboratory (Bldg 075)** **College Park, Maryland 20742**	**Telephone: 301-405-7449** **Toll Free: 800-464-3742** **Fax: 301-405-8134** **ericae@ericae.net** **http://ericae.net**

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)